




MORALE BOOSTER

OCTOBER 1977



MORALE BOOSTER

the official journal of

UNITED FOR OUR EXPANDED SPACE PROGRAMS*

Volume VI Number 5

October 1977

J. Graham Maughan, Editor

Linda Strickler, Producer

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>Article</u>	<u>Page No.</u>
Membership Roster, U.F.O.E.S.P.	1
Three's a Charm	3
Space or War: A Speech by J. Graham Maughan	4
Stimulus-Response, November 4, 1977	11

COVER ARTIST: Gordon A. Meggison IV

*U.F.O.E.S.P. is a tax-paying, grass-roots organization dedicated to education and edification: education of the general public and edification of the nations' space-policy makers concerning the importance, necessity and urgency of expanded space programs.

Copyright © 1978 United For Our Expanded Space Programs

All rights reserved.

Gregg A. Ackley
PSC Box 4665
Dyess AFB, TX 79607

Doug Andrew
8668 Sturbridge Drive
Cincinnati, OH 45236

Carol Andrews¹
2351 Washington Street
Apartment 305
San Francisco, CA 94115

David M. Anna
RD 1, Box 314
Patton, PA 16668

Michael A. Armstrong
NC #50
5700 North Tamiami Tr.
Sarasota, FL 33580

Thomas Peter Bahr
1282 Lake Drive Road
Rural Route #3
Sedro Woolley, WA 98284

David & Christine Beaucage
1581 Garland Avenue
Tustin, CA 92680

Linda A. Beltz
500 North Illinois Street
Arlington, VA 22203

J. David Bennett
P.O. Box 5055
Tampa, FL 33675

David Bersson
3502 Central Avenue
Nashville, TN 37205

James C. Blankenship
6732 East 39th
Tucson, AZ 85730

Ed Brault
PSC Box 3112
Minot AFB, ND 58705

John Brautlacht
P.O. Box 867
Bothell, WA 98011

Gregory Bridges
3711 Poplar Avenue
Memphis, TN 38111

Kay Briggs
P.O. Box 5077
Woss, B.C.
CANADA VON 3P0

Marsha Brim
Box 2908
Springfield, IL 62708

Robert Brown
USF #373
Tampa, FL 33620

Jan Buchanan
1932 N.W. 2nd Avenue
Gainesville, FL 32603

William Bunker
8218 South Whitworth Road
Gustine, CA 95322

Holly Ann Burt
15133 El Soneto Drive
Whittier, CA 90605

Peter Citrak
663 Sandra Lee Court S.E.
Olympia, WA 98503

Clifton L. Clark
4812 Old Dominion Drive
Arlington, VA 22207

IVAN CLARK²
628 CHAPEL STREET
HAMPTON, VA 23669

John Clark
760 Alhambra Circle
Coral Gables, FL 33134

Sandy Critchlow
107--1320 King Albert Avenue
Coquitlam, B.C.
CANADA V3J 141

Sharon Crowell-Davis
Route 1, Box 33A
Auburn, AL 36830

Clifton B. Davis
6200 West Tidwell, Apt. 701
Pasadena, TX 77093

Jill Eastlake
925 Dedham Street
Newton Centre, MA 02159

Elton T. Elliott
1999 Wiessner Drive N.E.
Salem, OR 97303

Amy Bouska Erbach
Department of Mathematics
V.P.I. and S.U.
Blacksburg, VA 24060

Federation Trading Post
Charles Weiss, Proprietor
2556 Telegraph Avenue
Berkeley, CA 94704

Kelly & Polly Freas
Route 4, Box 4056A
Virginia Beach, VA 23457

Linad Freeman
5422 Skyline Drive
Shawnee Mission, KS 66205

Samuel J. Friendly
1850 N.E. 142nd Street
Apartment 9T
North Miami, FL 33181

Larry Friesen
502 South Austin No. 17
Webster, TX 77598

Donald Garvey (Doc)
33655 Lincoln Drive
Abbotsford, B.C.
CANADA V2S 1S1

Nicholas P. Gerety
2360 "G" Street
Springfield, OR 97477

Ron Gillies
15920 Patricia Drive
Edmonton, Alberta
CANADA T5R 5N4

Chuck Heckert
1304 South Rouse
Pittsburg, KS 66762

Jes Hinrichs
2538 Foothill Drive
Vista, CA 92083

Lyn Hopkins
710 Caroline Street
Port Angeles, WA 98362

Loretta Jackson
P.O. Box 26824
Tucson, AZ 85726

Jim Johnston
16504 48th Avenue
Surrey, B.C.
CANADA V3S 4N7

Elizabeth Kobe
Box 595
College of St. Benedict
St. Joseph, MN 56374

Timothy B. Kyger
505 South Roosevelt
Apartment D-1
Mesa, AZ 85202

Helen Ledingham
37 Park Avenue
Chatswood, N.S.W.
AUSTRALIA 2067

Jacqueline Ann Lee
860 E Estate Boulevard
Charleston, SC 29407

Dannell Lites
2225 East Street
Texarkana, TX 75501

Edward M. Llano
824 West 176th Street
Apartment 5F
New York, NY 10033

ROBERT LOVELL, JR.
10908 WEST 65TH TERRACE
APARTMENT 303
SHAWNEE, KS 66203

Ernst Luposchinsky, III³
405 Eighth Street West
Northfield, MN 55057

Michael MacDonald
858 McClelland Drive
MacDill AFB, FL 33621

Michael A. Mahaffey
118 Colorado
Dyess AFB, TX 79609

J. GRAHAM MAUGHAN⁴
775 CAMINO DEL SUR
APARTMENT H-6
ISLA VISTA, CA 93017

Ralph E. Melody
801 Highland Avenue
Wilmington, DL 19808

Morris H. Middleton
4424 Bruno Road
Little Rock, AK 72209

Margaret McEwen
308 East Francis
Jacksonville, AL 36265

Christine McGowan
4 Fulview Court
Blackburn, Victoria
AUSTRALIA 3130

Bevin C. McKinney
P.O. Box 333
Walnut Creek, CA 94596

Steven C.V. Nall
PSC Box 5166
Eglin AFB, FL 32542

John Nelson
P.O. Box 341
Port Hardy, B.C.
CANADA VON 2P0

Ray Nelson
333 Ramona Avenue
El Cerrito, CA 94530

Rosa B. Oliver
9408 Michael Drive
Clinton, MD 20735

R. J. Ortega (Arjay)
204 El Campo Drive
South San Francisco, CA 94080

David Park
65 Old Brook Road
Dix Hills, NY 11746

Jay Parks
P.O. Box 172
Eastsound, WA 98245

Tom Perry
25 Locks Road
Locks Heath, Hants
ENGLAND SO3 6NS

R. Bruce Pittman⁵
138 Via Mesa Grande
Redondo Beach, CA 90277

Kenn G. Porter
1582 Thelma Close
Victoria, B.C.
CANADA V8N 5A1

Janice Scott Preston
225 Church Street N.E.
Vienna, VA 22180

RA Studios
Ron Russel, Proprietor
P.O. Box 1229
San Rafael, CA 94901

Cynthia Randall
5222 South Brighton
Seattle, WA 98118

Neil Rest
4433 West Walton
Chicago, IL 60651

David A. Roach
1133 Lum Street
Corpus Christi, TX 78412

Kathleen A. Rodak
3218 South Byron Street
Seattle, WA 98114

Jeffrey Nels Roloff
2535 Lyon Steet
San Francisco, CA 94123

Kathryn Routliffe
26 Fownes Street
Moncton, New Brunswick
CANADA E1E 3N1

Norton S. Savlin
6510 North Mozart
Chicago, IL 60645

Tony Schreiber
1214--8th Avenue S.E.
Calgary, Alberta
CANADA T2G 0M7

David P. Spiek
556 East Loula
Olathe, KS 66061

Frank Stodolka
P.O. Box 456
Minneapolis, MN 55440

Genevieve W. Strickler
338 Wind Sun Way
Camano Island, WA 98292

LINDA ANN STRICKLER⁶
775 CAMINO DEL SUR
APARTMENT H-6
ISLA VISTA, CA 93017

Jane Carol Subic
5247--15th N.E. #103
Seattle, WA 98105

Somtow Sucharitkul
Asian Composers Expo 78
54/1 Soi Nana North
Sukhumvit 3, Bangkok 11
THAILAND

Sidney Trim
2991 East 43rd Avenue
Vancouver, B.C.
CANADA V5R 2Z4

¹General Secretary, Antares Chamber ⁴President

²General Secretary, Vega Chamber ⁵Chairspacer, SAC

³Assistant President, Inter. Aff. ⁶Treasurer

Larry Tucker
1707 Lucille
Wichita Falls, TX 76301

Doug Van Dorn
809 Edgebrook, Apt. 104
De Kalb, IL 60115

Teri Wald
7680 N.W. 6th Court
Plantation, FL 33324

Linda Walls
5222 Belmont, Apt. 204
Dallas, TX 75206

Anthony D. Ward (Skip)
3262 N.E. 88th
Portland, OR 97220

H. TERRY WEPSIC, M.D.
12996 VIA LATINA
DEL MAR, CA 92017

Terrie L. West (Mahara)
P.O. Box 35045 Stn. E
Vancouver, B.C.
CANADA

Alexander S. Whitaker
54 Hassart Street, Apt. 2D
New Brunswick, NJ 08901

Henry M. Wills, Jr.
7389 South Dunrobin Court
Hanover, MD 21076

Robert Winfield
Route 2, Box 481B
Salem, VA 24153

John Woodhouse
60 Holders Hill Road
Hendon, London
ENGLAND NW4 1LR

William Zinardy
23 Puritan Road
Somerville, MA 02145

Passive, Active, LIFETIME

THREE'S A CHARM!

October 29, 1977 is the third anniversary of the foundation of United For Our Expanded Space Programs. The growth of the year past is equal to the advances of our first two years of struggle in the Space Revolution. Never slackening our pace, using every resource, always maintaining the firmest and clearest perspective of our goals, United For Our Expanded Space Programs has established itself over the twelve months just completed as a well-founded, dynamic, and highly productive organization. In the year 1977-78 we should honor our achievement by working under the banner, "Today, Earth; tomorrow, Mars!" Comrade spacers! It is time to go interplanetary!

These histrionics are not solely for the membership's amusement. There is a fundamental truth at the core of them. As always, the fullest understanding of the progress of the organization is an examination of the membership statistics. In October of last year U.F.O.E.S.P. had 32 members. This number now stands at 97. When once there was hardly one center of our work in the United States, now our cadres work in five or six centers, not all within America. Indeed, over 17% of the membership resides abroad in Thailand, Canada, England, and Australia. The membership has deepened through the addition of the lifetime category and the first year of its inception has had the result of five members. The passives continue to outnumber the lifetimes and actives together but the Board of Governors of U.F.O.E.S.P. cannot feel concern or alarm when such creative spacers as Ray Nelson, noted science-fiction author, Tim Kyger, publications chief for the 36th World Science-Fiction Convention (Iguanacon), Janice Scott Preston, member of the Star Trek Welcomittee, and Jill Eastlake, Treasurer for the Boston in 80 Worldcon bidding committee are among the many representative of the membership section.

The scores of new members who signed up with the Revolution since our second anniversary did not descend upon U.F.O.E.S.P. out of the blue, as coincidental or miraculous as many of the memberships appeared at the time of processing. Delegations to spacer events, particularly science-fiction conventions, spent many hours of patient discussion, persistent

(continued on p. 17)

SPACE OR WAR: A SPEECH

by J. Graham Maughan

Keynote Address of CHRYSE-1, Delivered Sept. 4, 1977

Alexandr Solzhenitsyn in the chapter of The Gulag Archipelago, "The Zeks as a Nation," discusses the prisoners of the slave-labor camps of Stalinist Russia as an anthropologist would discuss, in a learned journal, the lives and customs of some newly discovered savage tribe. At the close of his section on the zeks' moral view of the Universe, he makes this statement:

"Finally, there is one composite commandment: don't trust, don't fear, don't beg! In this commandment, the common, national character of the zek is cast, like a piece of sculpture, with sharp definition. How can one (in freedom) rule over a people steeped in such a proud commandment? It is awesome even to think of it!"

This commandment explicitly expresses the nature of the world in which we live. We dare not trust our national leaders because they are leading us to Nuclear War in the near future. We must not fear our national leaders because fear only fuels their personal energy-cycles and short-circuits ours. And we cannot beg them under any circumstances for anything because they will only perceive our supplications as admissions that we have abdicated authority over our own lives and given it completely to them.

These are harsh words. But we live in the Nuclear Age and the priorities of survival demand abandonment of all national sentimentality, old-fashioned glory, and wishfully hopeful thinking. If spacers are to live through the next ten years, let alone realize the great benefits of the Spacer Dream, they will have to apply to the War and the Revolution rigorous analysis, unwavering honesty of view, maximum resources, and firm resolve to see the task to its successful conclusion.

The world today is at war. The strife is so widespread, so intense, and so formal that we are justified if we conclude that the long-awaited World War III rages about us as an indisputable historical FACT. In the remarks to follow, I will support the reality of World War III, investigate its progress, and present what I view as the only realistic solution to the crisis.

First the crisis must be defined. The crisis is not the prevention of World War III because, as we will shortly see, World War III is very much an immediate and mundane, in the truest sense, reality and it started many months ago. Nor is the crisis the prevention of the escalation of World War III to the nuclear level because the use of nuclear weapons is, in a fundamental way, out of everyone's control and thus inevitable. It is not even the prevention of the entry of the United States of America into the War because our nation is one of the two most powerful influences creating the formal character of the conflict. The crisis is getting our nation out of the War before nuclear weapons are used by or against America.

The objection people raise most frequently when I speak of World War III in the present and past tenses is that the War has not been declared officially. This objection arises from a common misconception. "World War I" and "World War II" are historical terms. That is to say, scholars, academics, intellectuals, and officials have recognized the unity of each conflict and have applied a general term to avoid semantic confusion. This situation is proven quickly by even a cursory examination of the official records of the conflicting parties in each conflict. In neither case of global war can one find a single, solitary declaration of "World War." States of war between one country and another are declared to exist. Each pair of countries requires a separate declaration of war, none of which refer, in the slightest way, to the existence of a state of world war. Furthermore, the dates of these many declarations of war are varied, spanning a period of years. For example, in World War II, Great Britain and Germany went to war on September 3, 1939; Germany and Russia came to final grips with one another on June 22, 1941 while the United States did not enter the fray until December 8, 1941. However, most Western scholars date the beginning of the War from September 1, 1939 when Poland was invaded by Germany and when a state of war existed formally only between Poland and Germany.

People are also reluctant to accept the existence of World War III because it is not yet nuclear. This criticism is the consequence of the introduction of atomic weapons at the end of World War II and the subsequent common belief that a future world war must needs include nuclear weapons from the beginning because the Great Powers at the end of the Second World War quickly acquired nuclear arsenals. But there is little basis for this reasoning. The first two world wars were confined almost exclusively to conventional weaponry so there is no a priori reason why the Third World War would not be limited essentially to conventional arms. Furthermore, this concentration on conventional weapons is to some degree the result of conscious choice on the part of the combatants. Although poison gasses were used in the last half of World War I, they were not used in World War II. Another example of this conscious restraint is aerial bombardment of civilian populations. There was none in World War I and the constraint lasted in World War II for the first year of the war, at least between Germany and Great Britain. Perhaps more important than these considerations is the evolution of conventional weaponry since 1945. The tanks, assault rifles, mortars, howitzers, and bombs of today are so much deadlier, more accurate, and sophisticated than their counterparts of the conflicts of 30 and more years ago that they are almost in a different category. Beirut, a large and cosmopolitan city, was leveled by gangs of armed men using rockets fired from the shoulder, heavy machine guns, light mortars and recoil-less rifles with few tanks, fewer planes, and no ships or helicopters at all.

There is one more major criticism of the use of the term "World War III" with reference to the planetary conflict of the day. People may agree with my analysis so far but still balk at use of the term because the conflicts which comprise the global strife have not, as a rule, been declared formally by the participants as is the case with the twentieth century's first two world conflagrations. Cyril Falls, an eminent British military historian, has discussed at length the evolution of warfare from the American Civil War to the Indo-China conflict, in his book One-Hundred Years of War, published in the 1950s. He supports the contention that just as galaxies, organisms, stars, and other familiar phenomena have evolved over time, so has war evolved through the years. One of the most powerful and significant aspects of this evolution has been the increasing informality of major wars in the past century. Whereas in the past, nations went through rather elaborate and extensive procedures to declare war on each other, nations today simply go to war and let the historians provide the formality formerly provided by diplomats. There is no need to discuss this point at length because recent history provides numerous and sufficient examples of this evolution. The Vietnam War, the various rounds of war in the Middle East since the establishment of Israel, and the Bangladesh War of Independence are only the more prominent examples of informal war of a major character we have witnessed or endured in the days since the close of World War II. Nations today do not declare war, they just attack and fight.

To justify fully the use of the historical term "World War III" one must provide strong evidence of actual combat and this combat's formality. The best way to provide this evidence is to discuss the War's fronts, alliances, and progress. I would like to turn attention now to the War today.

Imagine a map of Earth. The great regions of the conflict are South Asia, Europe, and Africa. Most of the major fronts of the War are located in Africa. The Western Saharan Front, the Racial Divide of the South, the Angolan Front, the African Horn, and the Armageddon Front fracture Africa and bind intimately the battles there with the battlegrounds of Europe and South Asia. In the Western Sahara, Mauritania, Algeria, Morocco, and Polisario (a liberation movement seeking independence of the territory of the Western Sahara) fight for possession of vast phosphate deposits and outlets on the Atlantic Ocean. On the Armageddon Front of Sinai, the West Bank, and the Golan Heights, Israel seeks to establish permanently its hegemony against Egypt, Syria, and Jordan with their many North African and Middle Eastern allies. The Angolan Front appears a settled issue in the world press but 20,000 Cuban troops are tied down there and the Unita liberation movement, with the aid of South Africa, controls 40% to 60% of the countryside, depending on time of year, local balances of forces, resupply efforts, and other dimensions of battle. The great Racial Divide of the South, the most active front next to the African Horn, runs from Capetown to Johannesburg, along the Mozambique border with Rhodesia, across the Zambian border, down

the western boundary of Botswana, like an enormous hook ripping out the bottom of Africa. Finally, the battles on the Horn stretch from the Kenyan border to Djibouti through the Ogaden, then across Eritrea to thin out along the Sudanese border and disappear in the southern Sudan.

The European Theatre is the center of operations of the battles against the International Terrorist Movement. The four most intense sectors are Northern Ireland-Eire-England, the Basque line, West Germany, and Italy. These sectors saw the beginning of hostilities in the late 1960s but it is only with the expansion of operations during the past year that the theatre has taken a formal character. The hostilities in Europe, however, are not limited to the terror campaigns. Cyprus simmers under the partial occupation of Turkey. Greece quarrels with Turkey not only over this occupation but over exploitation rights in the Aegean Sea, too. An independence movement grows in Corsica while Eastern Europe has periodic outbursts of popular unrest. The relative calm Americans perceive in Europe is the result of sparse reporting in American communications media of the strife there (which statement is true of a good deal of the world conflict).

The fronts of South Asia are continuously active but at a low intensity usually. The hottest sectors are the Berserker Front and the southeastern extension of the International Terrorist Front. Cambodia is at war with all her neighbors (Laos, Thailand, and Vietnam) and well deserves her line of battle being called "Berserker." The southeastern extension of the International Terrorist Front forms a giant arc running from the southern provinces of the Philippines, around through Malaysia, through Thailand into Burma. On this line, the severist fighting rages in the Philippines. But the Malaysian insurgency maintains a steady level of conflict while the Burmese war is only temporarily quiescent. However much lower the levels of fighting here since the close of the Vietnam War, the remnants of that war are white-hot embers that refuse to be put out.

These many battlegrounds and fronts are not simply a coincidental selection or occurrence of isolated, very local disputes. We may roughly speak of two camps, the communists and the capitalists, warring with one another, if we understand the terms of reference not to be formal or rigorous definitions of political ideology but rather to be metaphorical usages which encompass the many variations of communist and capitalist experience. Each of these fronts gains a fundamental formality from the superpower rivalry of the United States and Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. Almost invariably, if both countries are present in a strong way in a region or sector of the War, they are supporting opposing factions. Their presence is not modest by any means. It is difficult to find places that do not have one nation or the other working assiduously for its (selfish) interests. Their diplomatic efforts on behalf of client states are consistently extensive while their roles as weapons suppliers to World War III are a constant embarrassment in the free press. Each superpower pursues an active when not aggressive foreign policy and both are continually conscious of their power and prerogatives.

This rivalry is fundamental to the coherence of World War III but it is not the most important element creating the War's formal nature. Perhaps the most important element is the network of alliances, supplier relations, and intersecting fronts. Israel and South Africa have tighter relations every month. Early this year the Cairo Declaration stated the unity of the Arab cause against Israel with the Black African cause against South Africa. The international terrorists train in Palestinian refugee camps, Libya, Iraq, Western Europe, and Japan while the leaderships of the various groups co-ordinate actions around the world. The second most important element is the fact that the opposing sides on the fronts are of the left and right. Even on the Horn of Africa, Somalia has a far more conservative regime than has Ethiopia. In the battles of Southern Africa, Europe, the Middle East, and most of South Asia this confrontation between communist and capitalist is sharp and explicit. Another factor creating formality of conflict is the interconnection of the many fronts with regards to personnel, geography, and diplomacy. The international terrorists concentrate their actions in Europe but receive arms and money from the United States (where many local brigades conduct bombings) while, as we have seen, their operations continue around the world throughout South Asia. The capitalists of South Africa, Rhodesia, and Namibia have heavy economic relations with those of Western Europe. The United Nations

is split between left and right and its growing concern over race relations in southern Africa coupled with its disapproval of Israeli policies may well result in an assertive role reminiscent of the Congo or Korea.

Nor should one think that the intensity of World War III is too low to justify recognition of its reality. Hundreds of thousands battle along the battlelines of the African Horn while over a million troops are mobilized in the Middle East at a time of moderate fighting. The war against international terrorism spans continents with millions of soldiers, police, militiamen, terrorists, collaborators, and random civilians locked in battle and victim to combat. King Hassan's opening gambit to take Morocco's share of the Western Sahara was a "people's march" of 400,000. Many divisions are deployed on the Racial Divide and Angolan Front of southern Africa. The wars of Cambodia have displaced millions of her own people and visited sorrow and strife on thousands upon thousands of her neighboring nations' citizens. The yearly sales in the arms trade, the number of nations involved directly in one of the major fronts of the War, the economic underpinnings of the combatants, and mobilizations underway all over the world to produce more for the fronts are only some of the significant dimensions measuring the intensity of World War III which time does not permit more than my mentioning them here. Every one of them provide the same reading: a conflict of truly global proportions.

In the fall of 1973, under the combined stimuli of the Yom Kippur War, the Saturday Night Massacre, and the Arab Oil Embargo, I began to study nuclear strategy, weapons, and proliferation, international relations, and modern world history. There is no point reviewing here those studies, which continue today, except to say that from them I have gained a sense of the future so strong that I feel mathematical confidence in a series of predictions of future history which arose naturally from my studies.

The predictions are:

- (1) Full-scale war in the Middle East no later than July 1, 1978, with the most likely interval for the outbreak of hostilities the period from late November to early December 1977.
- (2) The war on the Horn of Africa will formalize and internationalize its character no later than January 31, 1978. In this context, formalize means that the background combatants will come forward publicly with their alliances while internationalize means that troops of one or more countries outside Africa will be introduced in force.
- (3) The conflict in southern Africa will become a general race war with an international character no later than September 30, 1979.
- (4) Nuclear weapons will be used on a major front of World War III no later than December 31, 1981.

The United States of America, as the world, is at a critical juncture in its history. The aforementioned predictions constitute in my mind the rock-bottom, inevitable features of the progress of World War III in the next five years. The question before us, as stated in the beginning of this speech, is how to prevent the participation of America in the nuclear confrontation to come. I have a solution and it represents to me the only realistic answer to this crisis. I share it with you now.

The plan has two parts. The first half concerns American policy towards the War and it has four provisions. Number one, no to the neutron bomb and the cruise missile as well as all other new developments in strategic warfare, such as the MX-heavy and mobile-missile system. The Pentagon claims the Russians are many years behind the U.S. in these developments so there is plenty of time to pick up the programs if the Russians continue to be paranoid about America. Number two, a unilateral cutback in our strategic forces of an insignificant sort but as a definite token of our good intentions to eliminate nuclear weapons from Earth if possible. A reduction of warheads on our land-based ICBMs from 4,000 to 3,750 is an example of what might be done (as I don't have the pre-

cise figures of warheads on our land-based ICBMs, the numbers are for illustration only). Number three, an address to the world in which the President of the United States says: (a) any nation with nuclear weapons is considered capable of taking care of itself alone; (b) the U.S. considers the only justification for use of nuclear weapons is being attacked first with same; and (c) the U.S. will, so to speak, ring itself with a wall of nuclear fire, putting our nuclear weapons on, metaphorically speaking, a hair trigger for the transition period initiated by the first two actions. We must be realistic and recognize that the first two without the third would be tempting fate. Number four, and perhaps most important, the President in this same address would announce that it is time for REALITY to intervene in discussions of nuclear war and the only way this realistic sense can be achieved is to witness a (mock) small nuclear "war." The President would not announce the time, place, or extent of hostilities other than to say that it would occur in the near future, in an uninhabited region under U.S. jurisdiction, and would involve only a few bombs or warheads. My scenario, keeping in mind that no scenario actually would be given in the speech, would be two sites (because war, nuclear or otherwise, is not fought alone), with each site suffering from three to five hits (for example, one bomb from a plane and the rest divided equally between land-based and submarine-based missiles), the "war" taking place seven to nine months after the announcement.

The second half of this plan for peace and prosperity in the Solar System would be an address to the world by the Vice-President of the United States proclaiming our project to settle the Solar System. This speech would be quite detailed and would specifically support the following programs: three more Shuttle craft (assuming the speeches are given in the next year or two), a rendezvous with Halley's Comet using the Solar Sail, a peopled mission to Mars preceded by two survey missions of the planet (see *Analog*, June 1977), the production of the first operational Solar Power Generating Satellite (probably not a full-scale model as we have to demonstrate the value of the concept before we build L-5 colonies to produce the full-scale ones in deep space), and the return to the Moon with a hopefully international scientific institute on Luna.

The corpses pile to the sky while the mud and fire of World War III churn higher and higher on the horizon of the world. The space revolutionary surveys the carnage and wonders how the machinery of the Space Revolution can overwhelm the mechanized death of the Great Planetary War. Hundreds of billions of dollars feed the weapons-makers while only pittance nourish those extending humanity's reach throughout the Solar System. Each day news of enormous advance, fierce decline, and pregnant upheaval crackles from the many fronts of World War III while weeks may go by without word of the progress of the Space Revolution. Can the War be stopped or dampened by anything? Is the peaceful promise of the Space Revolution a mad dream?

The opposition between the Space Revolution and World War III is the confrontation of the constructive force of expansion off planet with the destructive force of planetary conflict. Engineers and technicians have dominated the Space Revolution but their enterprises have always been supremely scientific in their conception and implementation. Science is the epitome of constructive activity. War, on the other hand, is so blatantly destructive that no elucidation can amplify war's mindlessness and stupidity. The essence of war is stockpiling. The resources for war are re-arranged but only slightly: a faster bullet here, a thicker plate of armor there. But the military depots grow ever larger, greater industrial mobilization is achieved, production rates push higher, and the rate at which it is all destroyed on the battlefield increases. War is the ultimate potlatch: total commitment of resources to a clearly understood destructive process, all for the sake of prestige.

The Space Revolution has shaped our lives for two decades while World War III has marred our lives less than two years. Time is some compensation for the billions more spent on the War than on space. But more important is the constructive character of the Revolution. Viking lands on Mars and transmits geological information, meteorological data, soil chemistry findings over a period of many months. This wealth is not gathered at Langley Research Center or Jet Propulsion Laboratory on magnetic tapes which are then sent to the furnace. No, the tapes are stored to be used again and again. Pioneer 11 passes Jupiter and boggles our minds with the close vistas of Giant Jupiter in 1973 and six years later, rather than

self-destructing in deep space, passes ringed Saturn (no longer alone!) and transmits more data for our tapes. The Skylab space station is dark and drifting into Earth's lower atmosphere, eventual fate to burn up in a final plummet to Earth. But NASA has an inexpensive plan to use the Space Shuttle to send a booster to Skylab to send the space station to a higher orbit so that it can be used again. . .and again. The Space Revolution builds; World War III demolishes. The strength of the Revolution lies in this difference.

But the pacific factors of the Space Revolution are not limited to abstract ones like time and fundamental character. Many practical yet profound ameliorative factors would be introduced into the world's international relations as a consequence of increased space efforts.

In the first place, the knowledge gained by space probes of the dynamics of other planetary atmospheres and structural processes; the information gathered by remote sensing of Earth's water, food, and geologic resources; and the data accrued from projects designed to transfer industrial processes to space would serve as the foundation for the creation of goods and services directly related to the needs of the people which underlie much of the unrest and turmoil observed on Earth. Improved weather forecasts could save hundreds more lives and millions more dollars of property damage each year. More sophisticated analyses of crop yields, crop infestations, and soil compositions could well result in enormous lessening of the malnutrition and famine which afflict two-thirds of the world's population. Greater understanding of geologic formations and mineral deposits could affect tremendously the ability of nations to provide for themselves (and others) the basic materials necessary for the industrialization imperative for the standard of living to which the West is accustomed and towards which the underdeveloped nations strive. These examples of the potential of the rational use of space have been demonstrated over and over. Certainly a world with more food, basic commodities, and a greater ability to predict natural disaster would be a world with fewer stresses and tensions.

Secondly, a tradition of co-operation already exists amongst those associated with space projects, a tradition that would only increase with an expansion in space activities. Although the Apollo-Soyuz Test Project is the most recent and spectacular example of this co-operation, it is by no means the most important one that could be given. For years, scientists and space engineers around the world have been sharing data gathered from deep space probes, planetary missions, lunar landings, experiments conducted in Earth orbit on satellites and space stations, to name only a few areas of space research. Co-operation in space has extended beyond simple information sharing, however. Diverse nations have co-operated in the actual design and launch of many space missions. For example, the Soviet Union has provided launchers and launch facilities to India. For another example, the United States has rented to some of its allies the launch facilities at Cape Canaveral and has sold them boosters in some cases as well. For a third example, the nations of Western Europe have created the European Space Agency which is funded by all and which plans missions conducted by and for Europeans as a whole. There is no question that this sort of activity would increase tremendously as a consequence of greatly enlarging the U.S. space program.

A third consideration is the possibility of redirecting much national energy from military concerns to space ones. Because the primary advances in weapons technology, particularly in the strategic sphere, concern accuracy (guidance systems) and propulsion; and because these two factors are the primary concern of much of the space program, it is not unlikely that an expanded space program could be undertaken at the same time a decrease in military expenditures is instituted without threatening the Republic's security. For example, a high priority weapons development program today is the subsonic, long-range cruise missile, launched from submarines or airplanes. With slight modification (replacing the nuclear payload with a scientific one and replacing the ship or plane with an interplanetary rocket), this program could be converted to an excellent probe of the atmospheres of Venus and Jupiter. As is the case with so many space technologies, this probe could be converted easily back to the original military design. A subtler aspect of the proposition is the possible benefit to peace of increasing military involvement in space. Dr. Carl Sagan argues cogently, if not completely convincingly, in Chapter 8 of his book, The Cosmic Connection, that this move would shift military concerns to an arena less threatening to

us all, engage the military in activities for which military organization is suitable, and provide the military with a field for "operations" which could absorb the military's energies for as far into the future as one might care to imagine. I should note that there would be only minor difficulty in orienting the defense industries towards space and away from military production, not only due to the fact that the needs of the two fields overlap to a large degree but also, as a result, because most defense contractors engage in space projects already. The likelihood of war on or over the Moon, now and scores of years into the future, is considerably less than the probability of war in or over southern Africa or the Middle East.

Furthermore, one should not overlook the prospects that space holds for dampening conflict within the United States of America. There is no question that the crime rate will not suddenly drop when space expenditures are enlarged significantly. No reasonable person would argue that the racial tensions which trouble so many communities will be relieved suddenly by focusing a much larger portion of our national resources on space. Yet it would be folly to say that an expanded space program, with the past proven potentialities of heightening national pride, drawing on the best material and personnel resources of the nation, and capturing and inspiring the imagination of the people, would not bring positive pressures, at least indirectly, to bear on such issues. Whatever the causes of the various manifestations of social disorder, the effects are undeniable. A cycle of repression/extreme expression develops, with each turn of the process being of greater intensity than the last. Social frustration leads to social unrest which leads to greater social frustration which, in turn, leads to greater social unrest. . . and so on, ad inferno. The positive effects of space exploration on the nation's spirit, coupled with the economic benefits to be gained for the random person by exploitation of the space environment, would be, at the very least, valuable agents in the effort to restore the ailing body politic.

Lastly, though only in terms of this speech, there are the implications for the world that such a course by the United States would have. America is the greatest nation on Earth: in terms of money, in terms of material development, in terms of military preparedness, and in terms of involvement in the planet's political, diplomatic, and economic affairs. Everyone agrees, no matter whether they approve of the country or not, that the U.S.A. is the cutting edge of history. We cannot be ignored. If the United States were to engage in greater space exploration and use of the space environment, the entire world would take notice. If the United States were to pursue a vigorous program of manned and unmanned development of our understanding and use of outer space, many nations, including our strongest, adversaries would re-evaluate their national and international policies, and make, in turn, a greater commitment to space in order not to be left behind by the United States. Since few, if any, nations have the resources of the United States, and since space expenditures are quite large while space projects require much diverse talent, few, if any, nations could afford to have both a large military budget and a large space program. As much space technology possesses military implications, it is not unreasonable to think that the latter would be selected over the former. One must also remember that many nations would have space expenditures which we do not have (such as building the educational system, higher and lower, to the point where it could provide personnel for space efforts) and thus would feel this pressure even more acutely. In this time of detente, this consideration is perhaps the most important. Although there is much debate as to the "real" meaning of detente, to any honest person desirous of a less dangerous world it must mean, at the very least, a willingness to take whatever opportunities which arise and to develop them if there is a strong probability they will lead to resolutions of a good part of the strife on troubled Earth. An expanded space program offers the United States such an opportunity and it should not hesitate to seize it.

Space is vast. It consumes the greatest energies of those who confront it. There is enough Universe for us all. Even at the height of the space race and the cold war, the competition between East and West in space was not violent. The astronauts and cosmonauts are renowned, well regarded, even revered figures of the world. To explore North America took over 325 years. How long will it take to explore Jupiter which is over 300 times as large as our planet? How long will it take to conquer Venus where the atmospheric pressure is 100 times that of Earth and the seas are molten lead? The Apollo-Soyuz Test Project generated

(continued on p. 17)

S T I M U L U S E S N O P S E R

November 4, 1977

Dear Mr. Maughan,

Thank you for the June-July Morale Booster. The first letter in Part A of "Stimulus-Response" for that issue impressed me very much. The answer impressed me even more. Your answer to the letter is the only key into the insight of your operational techniques. I have, indeed, been expecting a letter such as Cynthia Randall's sooner than now. I have been seeing through her eyes the reason for her point of view. Your approach is that of a "warrior" and I tend to agree with your method of Leadership. However, you should listen to Cynthia's remarks on "diplomacy." It is well to hit hard and low but one also should "exceed with delicacy."

Her statement that you are "war-oriented" is interesting but untrue. You appear to be "war-conscious" and this attitude is very healthy. It is an old method of finding the fit for the job by rough-talking the candidate to see if it jolts the ego. As long as the "rough talk" has its basis in the maneuver of "one-pointedness" you cannot fail to reach the goal. U.F.O.E.S.P. has to be "extreme" in the beginning and even when approaching the goal of attaining the glittering heights of the Space Revolution.

At the end of your answer you pointed out your limitations as a "leader" and, though I found this approach very honest, I hope it wasn't an unnecessary apology to the membership as a whole for your actions. Have you read Up the Organization by Robert Townsend? This book might be quite valuable as U.F.O.E.S.P. expands.

Continue to bang your shield with your sword and it may be that the ear of the masses heed the battle cry of the Warrior. We SHALL make it to the stars, damn it!

P.S. Another book for your reading list might be The Man Who Wanted Stars by Dean McLaughlin. It is very inspiring.

David L. Bersson
3502 Central Avenue
Nashville, TN 37205

Leadership is difficult and it is no coincidence that leaders across the board, no matter the following or organization they lead, possess certain sharp personality traits. The world rages in "peace" as well as "war" (what lies those words have become over history!) and no one can lead, i.e., be in the vanguard of social action, without encountering many rebuffs, ignorance, apathy, insults, and petty power politics. Because so many choose to play the game of "politics as usual," leaders are bound by the situation even when they deplore it. Because so many are pretending to leadership, those who truly make things matter have to be more adept than the mediocre at mediocrity even when their brilliance and obvious merits keep this sort of compromising to a minimum. Because of the mess the world always seems to be in, leaders develop some indifference to the feelings, manners, or sensitivities of the random individual.

The din of war and economic upheaval is deafening. Leaders must SHOUT if the people will be able to hear them whisper. The crises are complicated and many theorists are propagandizing their plans for the golden future. Leaders must speak RELENTLESSLY, RELENTLESSLY of the goals ahead, the paths to them, the dangers and rewards of each. There is, in fact, much implacable opposition to any and every plan. Leaders DO NOT FEAR; they always know their strength. These maxims are valid for organizations to the same extent they are applicable to individuals.

Diplomacy is not deniable; its necessity is not questionable. Its mea-

sure is the difficulty of the situation. Whenever leaders approach one another, they attempt a civil demeanor. Relations, on occasion, break down. But there is always some plot afoot to make good the damage done to the parties concerned. Leaders are notoriously OPPORTUNISTIC.

So, thank you, I don't mind if I do bang my shield with my sword, with my sword of unshakeable determination to ACTION upon my shield of implacable OBSERVATION and ANALYSIS. If the (South African) (Russian) (Chinese) (Iranian) (name your poison) ICBMs start flying because we were too stupid or timid to face reality and its necessary resolutions, it won't make a damn bit of difference how luxurious life off planet could be or could make life back on Earth. We will be dead just the same. Spacers must become the LAST WARRIORS. They must lead the species with their militant pacifism to the stars, yes, to the stars and beyond! The Universe is far deadlier than any human weapon, now or to be devised. Let us really challenge and risk our lives. Let us tackle the Universe! ***The Editor.

Dear Graham,

You edit Morale Booster well. I wasn't sure that I had written the letter you reprinted, it read so well. I can't say that I agree with you totally on your reply; and this is why (that rhymes, eh what?).

Mankind is at a crossroads, and that crossroads is that one of sheer species survival, at the most, or of the survival of technological civilization, at the least. The main reasons for this crisis are population growth and resources depletion. (These are the main reasons for World War III, too, at root. Even Marx's concept of class struggle arises from population pressures or resources depletion of some sort.) If someone blows up the technological civilization of today on Earth, it cannot be rebuilt, period. It takes a high-energy technology to extract any copper, iron, or other base metal that used to be found abundantly 100 or even 50 years ago. There is no petrol that can be manufactured by anything except high-energy technology. It is a bootstrap proposition. Consider this analogy to the situation: We're on a cliff to which to arrive we have walked up a gentle incline. That gentle incline is past resources, unavailable to us now. If we go off the cliff, we fall, and we cannot climb up the sheer cliffwall again to regain our high vantage point. So it is now, with humanity.

World War III? Oh, it is there. And it will get worse as more resources deplete, more people are born, and there is less and less food.

The only answer to this predicament is to open up this finite world to outside energy/metals/etc. The book, Limits to Growth, shows that if the world is kept finite, World War III won't even matter. You can stave off WWII all you want, set up a world-wide government, and so on, but as long as we have a technological civilization at all, with a finite world we collapse about 2100, no matter what variables you change.

So you change the basic premise. The world is not finite, it is infinite with eight other planets, 31 moons, and ghod alone knows how many asteroids in our Solar System alone.

But it is a one-shot proposition. The world situation, as you so well know, is deteriorating. Capital that can be risked to establish space settlements dwindles with the years. Government becomes more corrupt around the world. We must get into space as swiftly as we can for this is the species' only chance. If we blow it, humanity--that's us!-- does not get another chance.

This is why I will support even Olin Teague for Congress, militarist or not. It is that important. I will accept help from any corner from which it comes in this cause, because it is that important. Goldwater? Sure! He's FOR SPACE and we don't have the time to question his military

habits. All of mankind's eggs are in one basket and it is no time to argue politics. Sure, these people will increase the militarization of Earth. It's beyond the point that that matters. We got to get out. If we can get a settlement self-sustaining by 2010, then humanity may be safe. If Earth blows it, perhaps these off-planet settlers can carry on. (Though 2010's Moon colony will be too small still. Read up on genetic drift sometime. Oh yes, genetic drift is also one reason that mankind could easily be destroyed by a nuclear war.)

You see my point? The Space Revolution is going to have to come after space settlement for at this time our first priority is sheer species survival. Any time spent at this point, while the momentum can still be dissipated, can stop the Diaspora, or delay it just long enough so that it cannot happen in the long run to do anything. To wit, we may get a Moon colony but not one in enough time to get it self-sustaining.

As I said, even without WWII going nuclear, things will get bad enough soon enough resource/energy-wise that the species will not be able to support spaceflight, unless there are people out there mining the metals that they, and we, need.

But you are right, we don't have to be uncritical. I will continue to support Olin Teague but this organization need not be so uncritical, though if I were it. . . . World War III cannot be stopped, nor can at least a massive dislocation world-wide caused by the start of one of the Limits to Growth's scenarios. Look not at the ground, Graham, nor even to Europe. We cannot do anything about it until after we get outside the system and can then offer Earth help from outside. Look up, young man, look up!

You'll always get more support with a positive goal than a negative one. World War III will solve itself if we can get off planet in a big way. And better men than you or I or anyone in this organization have tried to stop world wars, and for lifetimes, and they have not succeeded. But they were not attacking the roots. By getting off planet and increasing the resources available, you strike at the roots of the problem.

Emphasize the positive. Space flight/exploration is good. World War III is bad but you eliminate the negative. It can be dealt with easier by getting into space than opposing it here on Earth.

God, I preach. . .

Tim Kyger
505 South Roosevelt, Apt. D-1
Mesa, AZ 85202

We're all going to have to do a little preachin', friend, before we see this War through. . .

The key element of your analysis is the socio-economic crisis popularly called "the energy-resources depletion-crisis." You have presented the arguments ably for the consequences of such an energy-resources crisis but have failed to substantiate the existence of the crisis as anything more than an abstract threat. Not only has the Club of Rome revised radically its earlier gloomy forecasts in the last few months but even the original ones of disaster did not climax until forty or more years had past. Any situation which does not reach critical mass until four decades have gone into the history books is not a "crisis" it is a "long-range problem."

Yes, humanity faces the collapse of civilization but the cause is much more immediate, tangible, and frightening than the supposed energy-resources crisis. Not only Big Oil but the Government and the Consumer's Movement are telling the nation in no uncertain terms that we face three or more years of an oil and food GLUT. There have been a torrent of books and reports of every expertise and veracity demonstrating the energy-resource

crisis is a crisis of MONEY and DISTRIBUTION, not DEPLETION. Every month new reports appear in the financial press of large deposits of minerals and new and unexpected reserves of fossil fuels. When the United States of America, comprising only %6 of the world's population, not only uses %40 of the raw resources exploited in any given year but also WASTES %40 of its energy use during that same year, the critical problem is hardly one of "running out of resources."

"Oh no," the experienced reader may be thinking, "I know what he's going to say next!" And such a reader is correct. World War III nears its second anniversary. Although there is still deep discussion amongst future historians of the correct "formal" date of the beginning of the conflict, none speak of less than thirteen months of history. The documentation for the conflict does not consist of piles of computer projections (they are not absent, only secondary), fictionalizations (although one could make a strong case using just such materials), or appeals to the logic of the situation (however obvious the course of the War). The documentation for World War III is found every day in the daily newspaper. Pick one. The Los Angeles Times, the Washington Post, the Baltimore Sun, the New York Times, the Seattle Post-Intelligencer, the Houston Chronicle, the Portland Oregonian, even such rags as the Santa Barbara News-Press provide reports from the fronts, analyses of the diplomatic maneuvers, logs of the troops and supplies being committed, all the gory details EVERY DAY.

"Alright!" the reader snaps in the skull, "Alright! So what does that have to do with space?" What it has to do with space is that the time schedules devised for the educational and lobbying schemes of most spacers, as well as the schemes themselves, are far too slow and far too limited to prevent the triumph of the militarists in this country who are already looking for someplace to intervene! And I am not being hysterical when I make such a statement. Panama, the Middle East (the latest specific victim mentioned being Kuwait; in the 1974 the talk was Saudi Arabia), and the African Horn are only the worst of many battlegrounds about which we have heard proposals or scenarios of American intervention in World War III. Open your eyes! The time is not the 1930s and the Great Depression (our parents version of the energy-resources depletion-crisis) but the 1970s. If there is any previous period of history analogous to our day, it is the period September 1939-June 1941, when World War II raged in Europe (Fall of France-July 1940, Conquest of the Balkans-Spring 1941), Africa (which battle of Tobruk? What intrigues in Cairo and Baghdad?), and South Asia (the Battle of Chungking dragged on for months).

The choice for the United States and Soviet Union was made for them by Japan and Germany at the close of that analogous period. For the moment, the choice is in the hands of the U.S. and U.S.S.R. rather than their many clients and protagonists. But the period is moving along quite rapidly and now we are not faced simply with Hitler, Mussolini, and Tojo, we are faced with Shah Reza Pahlevi, Begin, Vorster, Kim Il Sung, Park Chung Hee, Kaddafi, Amin, and Carlos ("The Jackal"). . . without drawing undue attention to the leaderships of Taiwan, Rhodesia, Ethiopia, Somalia, Algeria, or Morrocco!

The Space Revolution, through its unimaginable vistas of worlds, stars, and galaxies, has the power to transform humanity but it also has the practical benefit of ensuring our nation's security IF WE PURSUE THE OPTION SOON ENOUGH. But the time constraint is a POLITICAL obstacle, not a material resource barrier. This (tragic) (ironic) (unfair) (cursed) situation is the foundation for the necessity of spacers seizing, if it comes to that, political power. We are not politicians. We are not utopians. We are not enamored of public affairs. We are not any of these things naturally, in our hearts, in our obsessions, in our mundane lives. But we must become all of these things if we are to live in the strictest sense of flesh and blood. Mars is ours! But first we must settle the White House! ***The Editor.

Dear Graham and Linda,

It was a real pleasure to meet you and Robert Lovell at Suncon. It's too bad the hotel's attitude wasn't in keeping with the spirit of the con; but we all seem to have survived it.

I'm sorry that the air pollution (gasp!) forced me out of both your talk on space and war, as well as the U.F.O.E.S.P. party-workshop, since it appears to me that we (i.e., the membership) may well be on the verge of a very basic disagreement about the direction U.F.O.E.S.P. should take with regard to non-space activities, in particular, to what extent the organization should take sides in non-space controversies. I was especially disturbed by the statement in the May Morale Booster that "U.F.O.E.S.P. will stage a March Against the Neutron Bomb. . ." for two reasons. One, I think it is unwise on PR grounds--the antiwar movement left a bad taste in the mouths of many people and anything that implies that "antiwar" is synonymous with "pro-space" may be a big disadvantage for the spacer movement. Two, it is against my personal feelings. This is, of course, a dangerous thing to say, as it seems to imply that I am pro-war, which I'm not (what sane person is?). While I do not care to have the world go to war or to see space militarized, and while I freely admit that defense (and offense) spending drains off enormous amounts of time, money, manpower, and energy which could be more profitably invested elsewhere (space, for instance), nonetheless I am too much the pessimist to feel that an unilateral reluctance to arm is the way to peace. I have simply seen too many barbed wire fences that shouldn't be there, been hassled at too many borders, and had too many friends from countries where life can be very uncomfortable (Iran, Brazil, Rumania, Soviet Russia, Iraq) to believe that power unopposed must needs be humane. Certainly the world needs "militant pacifists" to keep that message alive (someday. . .we all hope) but we aren't all there yet (that's the problem!) so I hope you will give serious thought to a more stringent separation of personal and organizational views. It would be a shame to splinter so early.

School starts in two days so our local L-5 group had to get a table ready for the fall activities fair. . .anything to spread the word. We all need space to grow.

Don't work too hard and keep us out in the eastern wilderness informed of how things are going with y'all.

P.S. The stamped, self-addressed postcards are a fantastic idea.

P².S. Rovacon was a pleasant little con--small and very heavy on comics, but still okay. L-5 didn't show up as promised so we were the only spacer group there. We got 1½ sheets of signatures and 6 future memberships. No cars smashed this time. . .how dull!

P³.S. Guess what! This literary masterpiece just came back to me. It certainly took long enough to decide you didn't live at P.O. Box 27236 anymore. The trick now is to find those postcards to get the correct address.

Amy B. Erbach
Department of Mathematics
V.P.I. and S.U.
Blacksburg, VA 24061

One of the main frustrations we have building the Space Revolution is the necessity to deal heavily with the United States Postal Service. The address of the organization in San Francisco (P.O. Box 27236) is not an old address but a very current one. U.F.O.E.S.P. has not moved and if any member receives mail returned from the P.O. box, s/he should first suspect that the Postal Service has demonstrated its basic erraticism once again. When the Treasurer and I were in San Francisco for the AAS annual meeting, we went to the S.F. postal station where the organization maintains residence and spoke with the

clerks there who agreed they could not understand such mix-ups since U.F.O.-E.S.P. is well known to them. If there is any institution to which the commandment, "Don't trust, don't fear, don't beg," applies it is the United States Postal Service.

It is foolish to think that the Space Revolution can be separated, personally or organizationally, from "non-space" controversies. How can it be so separated when the limited advances already achieved in the expansion of civilization off planet have been integrated into our society? The strategic peace depends on space systems (President Johnson once said that the space program was worth every penny and more put into it just on this basis alone). Medical technology has been transformed by the Space Revolution. Events all over the world are shared immediately by the people of the world through communications satellites. New industrial processes, new resource reserves, maps more accurate than ever imagined, navigation on the high seas and many other areas or aspects of daily life are the direct outcome of our first attempts to expand off planet. To try to ignore the consequences of the Space Revolution is to abdicate our moral obligations not to follow blindly wherever our fantasies go.

As important a consideration is the one that if spacers focus in the narrow way you suggest on space, they run a very grave risk of becoming irrelevant to the nation's discussions of the future. Whether you or I personally like the situation or not, Amy, the overwhelming majority of people in this country do not care or think about the space program at all. If spacers are to get some national action on their dreams, they are going to have to make the expansion of civilization off planet meaningful in mundane terms to the people. If all we do is repeat over and over again the abstract benefits, philosophical logic, and awesome excitement and beauty of expansion off planet, all we can hope to achieve is the curious attention that people give to an idea when they want some intellectual entertainment or relief from the depressing reality of everyday life. Your experience at Rovacon 2 is particularly relevant in this context. If spacers have such difficulty banding together in the obvious way of joining organizations fighting for their interests, how can we possibly expect to impress the random citizen with the importance of an expanded space program? It has nothing to do with our organization, my philosophy, or any other such considerations. The L-5 Society has less than 2,000 members after two years of intense proselytization and literally millions of dollars of free publicity through discussions of the L-5 Plan in Time, Newsweek, New West, National Geographic, Analog, Sixty Minutes, and many, many other communications forums. The National Space Institute, founded by the late Dr. von Braun in July 1975 has only 8,000 or so members. To put these figures in perspective, at the time of the Seabrook nuclear plant occupation last spring in New Hampshire Newsweek had a box story on anti-nuclear power groups across the country. One group, whose name I do not recall exactly but it was something like Citizens Against Nuclear Power, came into existence in just a few days with 100,000 members! And this group was basically a "local" one since its membership almost exclusively is drawn from California. One-hundred thousand members almost overnight for one group is a pretty impressive performance, Amy.

I am not one of the people who found the anti-war movement distasteful but who in fact was refreshed, invigorated, and made to feel pride in this country by the fight against the butchery of Vietnam. What is more, I am not some fluke. At the recent AAS conference on Space Industrialization that I attended with our lovely Treasurer (and Producer!) I met many people who feel as I and the majority of the membership of this organization feel about the interconnections between space and war. Steven Durst who edits Space Age Review was in exile in Vancouver, Canada during the war when he had his vision of space. Terry Kersey, who marched on Washington with the Vietnam Veterans

(continued on p. 17)

(continued from p. 10)

lively discussion in many circles as to the value of international space projects. If the community of nations were to agree to pool their space efforts and to increase their space commitment prodigiously, a momentous and enormous advance on the road to world peace would be achieved. But the idea is radical, it is not in line with traditional thinking, there are doubts and hesitations. A leader is needed. Will the United States of America have the courage and foresight to say, "Lead if you will, follow if you must, but WE leave today for tomorrow!"?

For ourselves, the world, and everyone's children, now and to come, let us hope so.

(continued from page 16)

Against the War, had his vision of space just after escaping from a POW camp in Cambodia. Eleanor Garst, who works closely with Barbara Marx Hubbard (an L-5 director), has been involved with the peace movement since the 1960s and worked in Santa Barbara a few years ago for the Laucks Foundation (see June-July 1977 MB). Leonard David, student director for FASST, delivered a paper on the military in outer space and asked the question, are we going to say something about this development or accept it unquestionally? George Robinson delivered a paper on space law (he has an article on same in the October issue of Technology Review) in which he caustically remarked that the military is taking over space and "we haven't heard a peep of protest." I don't know how far East this consciousness extends, but out here in the Golden West spacers aren't so eager to see the arms race extended throughout the Solar System as your comments would imply is the case in the Far East.

Burying our heads in the sand about international relations or World War 3 is not going to stop it. Pretending the escalating arms race and the coming nuclear war don't exist is not going to make these distressing developments go away or disappear. Spacers must face this fundamental fact of life in the nuclear age: the arms race can't go on indefinitely and if we are going TO BE ALIVE ten or fifteen or twenty years from now (the minimum schedules for space settlements) we are going to have to stop the War Machine NOW. We do not have the convenient option of passing the problem on to our grandchildren. Our lives are at stake today. The Space Machine cannot go into high gear (which is what we are talking about in U.F.O.E.S.P.) until the War Machine is brought to a crawl. *** The Editor.

(continued from page 3)

explanation, and unflagging advocacy to persuade spacers the time is now to make our dreams into mundane experience. The conventions yielding most members were Balticon XI (4), Westercon 30 (23), and Suncon (25). Of the remaining new members, most joined in response to advertisements placed in Galaxy, Galileo, and The Magazine of Fantasy and Science Fiction this past summer. Although the delegations to space-science seminars or conferences strengthened the organization mostly through contacts and additions to the Tsiolkovsky Library, members in odds and sodds signed up with U.F.O.E.S.P. at them. We deliver the message of space and get more cadres to deliver that profound message of peace and prosperity in the Solar System to gain yet more cadres. The Revolution does not wait, it rumbles.

U.F.O.E.S.P. exists for more purpose than its simple growth. We are a political force and must make history if the people are to take our politics seriously. The major projects to build the Revolution of the past year were the Fourth Petition to the People's Representatives, the trial mass-letter campaign to Carter, our initial financial support of Governor Edmund G. Brown of California, and CHRYSE-1. The political projects of U.F.O.E.S.P.'s third year were essential for the second, and most critical, stage of spacers' political maturation. The crises of the Nuclear Age compress the time probabilistically available to change the course of events. As the premiere spacer group, we must prepare the road to power by blazing the trail for the vanguard of the Space Revolution and their allies. Our emphasis shifts now from the basic forms of citizen protest, letters and petitions, to the more serious forms of political rallies and partisan demonstrations. *****

UNITED FOR OUR EXPANDED SPACE PROGRAMS
P. O. Box 27236
SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA 94127

To

--	--	--